



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

III. — *Indo-European Notes.*

BY PROF. M. BLOOMFIELD,

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

I. *On the Vocalism and Accent of the Middle Participle in the Indo-European Languages.*

THE paroxytonesis of the perfect middle participle in Greek, *-μένος*, has every appearance of an accentual archaism; it has been always regarded as one of those non-finite verbal forms which, though imbedded in a recessively accented tense-system, has managed to escape retraction, until in the Lesbian Aeolic all opposition is overcome by universal barytonesis. The accent of *ἑσταμένος*, *πεφυγμένος*, etc., by the side of barytone *ἑσταμαι*, *πέφυγμαι*, etc., is certainly in a measure parallel to that of *εἰδώς*: *οἶδα*; *πεπονθώς*: *πέπονθε*; *λιπών*: *λίπε*; *στάς* (oxyt.): *στήν* (baryt.); *θείς* (oxyt.): *θῶ* (baryt.); *δοῖς* (oxyt.): *δῶ* (baryt.); *φάς* (oxyt.): *φῆν* (baryt.), etc.<sup>1</sup> But it is the custom now to derive the paroxytone type *πεφυγμένος* from a still older oxytone *\*πεφυγμενός*, in accordance with a supposed law which changes dactylic oxytones to paroxytones.<sup>2</sup> Now a rather subtle inconsistency on the part of those who advocate this derivation should be noted. On the one hand, the suffix *-μενός* is supposed to have been originally foreign to the perfect middle, the Vedic Sanskrit having *-ānás*; and it is further assumed that *-μενος* passed analogically from the present into the perfect, driving out the Greek representative of Vedic *-ānás*, but at the same time borrowing its accent, so as to become *-μενός*, and afterwards, by the dactylic law, *-μένος*. So far so good: this would explain the irregular

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the author, AJP. ix. 7 ff.; Hirt, *Der Indogermanische Accent*, p. 34.

<sup>2</sup> Wheeler, *Der Griechische Nominalaccent*, p. 66, in pursuance of a suggestion of Brugmann's; the latter, himself, a little doubtfully, *Grundriss*, II. 155; Hirt, *l.c.*, 26. Cf. Allinson's careful discussion of this subject, AJP. xii. 49 ff., which seems to have escaped Hirt's notice.

-μενός (from which -μένος is derived by the supposed dactylic law) quite as satisfactorily as is in the nature of many broad analogical explanations. But the same authors point in the same breath to the non-perfect participles used as proper nouns Σωζομενός, Ὀρχομενός, Φαμενός, though they previously placed their reliance upon the accent of the perfect participle, and as though these could illustrate the original accentuation of -μενος, whereas the oxytonesis of -μενός in the present middle participle according to their own first assumption is phonetically and accentually without excuse.<sup>1</sup> Thus the first argument, though far-fetched, is reasonable; the second tends to weaken the case materially.

Indeed, the type -μενός as an aboriginal modulation of the suffix in question is unlikely because the oxytonesis is naturally preëmpted by the type I.-E. -mnó, the ordinary form of the suffix in Avestan (*barəmnā*) and Latin (*alumnus*): -méno and -mnó accord with the usual vocalic and accentual relations. Theoretically, further, the types -méno and -mnó call for an additional variation -mono, a trace of which is preserved in the Baltic (Old-Prussian) *po-klausī-manas*.<sup>2</sup> The accent of the forms in -mono is likely to have preceded the suffix altogether, i.e. the type is  $\angle$  mono; cf. λείπω, λέλοιπα, λιπών respectively for the types μένο,  $\angle$  mono, and mnó. Now Brugmann's law, whose repeatedly announced demise still lacks a certain finality,<sup>3</sup> calls for *māna* as the Skt. continuation of *mono*. This, indeed, is the form in which this suffix appears in the language, and that, too, universally when the accent precedes the suffix on some syllable of the stem itself: i.e.  $\angle$  māna in *bhāramāna*-, etc. In practically all cases when the suffix of the participle is accented, it is another suffix, ānd, that appears,

<sup>1</sup> The majority of these oxytone proper nouns are from thematic presents: in addition to those above, Ἀγαπωμενός, Ἀγχομενός, Ἀκουμενός, Μελπομενός, Φιλουμενός, etc.; see Pape, *Wörterbuch der Griechischen Eigennamen*, p. xvii. Sober second thought will explain all these oxytones as forms whose accent is secondarily changed from barytonesis (ἀγαπῶμενος, etc.) on account of their use as proper nouns; not as forms that have preserved an accentual archaism.

<sup>2</sup> See most recently Wiedemann, *Handbuch der Litauischen Sprache*, p. 121.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. recently, Buck, *AJP.* xvii. 445 ff.; for a convenient historical bibliography on the question see Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, p. 14.

so that a knowledge of the fate of the accented forms of the suffix with *m* in Skt. is denied us. As far as can be seen, nothing stands in the way of assuming that the Greek perf. middle form in *-μένος* is the 'normal' form of the accented suffix; on the other hand, the barytone forms in Greek, type *φερόμενος*, etc., may be for *\*φόρομονος* (*\*φορόμενος*) = *bhāramānas*, whose *o*-vowel was in Proto-Hellenic times assimilated to the forms with accent on the suffix, such as *έσταμένος*, *πεφυγμένος*, etc. This explanation I have offered for some years in my lectures on noun-formation: it may claim the name of a reasonable hypothesis, if nothing more, and has at any rate the merit of avoiding the assumption of a structurally problematic oxytone form *-μενό* for early Hellenic times.

2. *Ionic έσκε = έστε, 'till.'*

In Archil. 14 and Anthol. vii. 727 (*έσκε θάνη*) we have an Ionic form *έσκε = έστε*, which seems to be textually secure; see Smyth, *Ionic Dialect*, § 716. The word joins the small list of dialecticisms, such as Thessalian *κίς = τίς*, and Ionic *κότερος = πότερος*.<sup>1</sup> If the form is correct, it fixes the *τ* of *έστε* as the regular representative of the palatalized labiovelar, I.-E. *q*; the basis of *έσκε = έστε* is I.-E. *esqe*. Through the agency of a number of scholars, the writer of these lines included, there has by gradual accretion arisen the four-fold etymological combination *έστε*, Lat. *usque*, Skt. *achā*, and Old Slavic *ešte*, one or the other part of which has from time to time been subjected to phonetic criticism.<sup>2</sup> That this criticism will in the end prevail against the striking closeness of meaning exhibited by these words I am loath to believe: the addition of *έσκε* helps to demonstrate the presence of a labiovelar; establishes the equivalence of Skt. *ch*, at least before a palatal vowel (*á*), with I.-E. *s* + labiovelar tenuis; and severs phonetically Locrian and Delphic *έντε* from this group.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gustav Meyer, *Griechische Grammatik*<sup>3</sup>, p. 260.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. AJP. vi., p. 41; KZ. xxxi., p. 12.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Solmsen, KZ. xxix. 333. *έντε* is likely to have been produced by the substitution with popular etymology of *έν* for *έσ*, the form *έστε* being felt as a compound *έσ-τε*.

The point which still remains unsettled seems to me to be whether the labiovelar tenuis was originally aspirated or unaspirated: nothing, as far as can be seen, stands in the way of either *esqe* or *esqhe*. In the last case the superlative ἑσχατος might ultimately find shelter under the same cover; the absence of dentalization would, however, presuppose an Ionic origin of the word; see Zubatý, KZ. xxxi., p. 61.

### 3. Latin *salūs*: *salvos*.

The formation of the stem *salūt-* from *salvo-* still awaits elucidation. Vedic *sarvá-tāt-*, Avest. *ha<sup>u</sup>rva-tāt-* are likely to be directly related, but they would require a Latin stem *salvo-tāt-*, from which a bridge to *salūt-* is not offered by any known phonetic experiences. Inasmuch, however, as the abstract suffixes *tāt-* and *tūt-* interchanged with one another in proethnic times (cf. Lat. *commūni-tāt-* and Goth. *gamaini-dūp-s*), nothing is in the way of a base *\*salvo-tūt-*, *salvi-tūt-*. If we divide now according to the natural syllabification of the word, *sal-uit-ūt*, we see that *salūt* may be due to that well-known kind of dissimilation which is known as haplology. Surely the medial syllable *uit* was similar enough to final *ūt* to give rise to the process; cf. *semestris* for *semimestris*, and see the discussion of the phenomenon in Meringer and Mayer's interesting book, *Versprechen und Verlesen*, p. 179 ff.<sup>1</sup> The question may be put why *servitūt-* does not similarly become *\*serūt-*: the answer may be that *ser-uit-ūt-* was held in check by *seruitūdo*, in which the two last syllables are not quite so similar. But there is nothing coercive about these processes; they are due to repeated blunders which the community has finally ceased to correct. Needless to say, the haplology in the Avestan stem *haurvat-*, which occasionally appears for *haurvatāt-*, is of entirely independent origin, just as *aməratāt-* for *aməratatāt-*: as these words occur frequently in close juxtaposition the strain is cumulative, and one or the other gives up one of the successive identical syllables.

<sup>1</sup> Possibly the *l* of *salut-* was labial and gave forth a slight *u* on its own account, so that *\*sal-uit-ūt-* really had yielded a stage *\*sal-ūt-ūt* before the dissimilation took place, but upon that I do not insist.

4. *The Fractional Numerals in Avestan.*

The stems *prišva* 'a third,' and *caprušva* 'a fourth,' are well authenticated in Avestan passages that admit of no misunderstanding. Superficially they have the appearance of extensions by suffix *-va* of types *priš* and *capruš*. They are at any rate comparatively recent formations of the Iranian period, there being no evidence for such fractional numbers in any other I.-E. language. The only attempt at explanation with which I am acquainted is that of the late Berlin Orientalist, Justus Olshausen, in a paper, entitled *Über die Bezeichnung der Bruchzahlen in den Pahlavî-Schriften*, Proc. Berl. Acad. of June 16, 1881. This scholar suggests very hesitatingly the presence of *aēva* 'one' in the suffix *va*. The more recent grammars and handbooks: Geiger, *Handbuch der Avesta-Sprache*; Bartholomae, *Altiranische Dialecte*, and *Awestasprache und Altpersisch (Grundriss der Iranischen Philologie)*; Jackson, *Avesta Grammar* (§§ 376, 819, 853), barely refer to these forms. They are readily intelligible as the adjectivized locatives plural of the cardinals *prišu* 'in three,' *caprušu* 'in four,' i.e. *prišva* means 'that which is in three'; *caprušva* 'that which is in four.' Extensions of inflected forms by suffixes are well known in modern languages (e.g. *ein zu nennender* and the like), and they have been assumed, especially by Professor Fick, for ancient speech as well. Thus no one will deny the possibility that the suffix *īo* may in a measure have been produced by the extension with suffix *o* of a locative case in *i* (Fick explains *Λακεδαιμόνιος* as loc. *Λακεδαιμονι* + suffix *ος*). As such explanations in general are doomed to remain problematic, endeavoring as they do to penetrate into the period of prehistoric glottogony, this Avestan case is of value, since it seems to prove them as real for a period itself of no mean antiquity.